



Planning Support Statement with regard to the demolition of existing stables and erection of one detached true bungalow, land at Bold Hall, Bold Heath

Introduction

This statement should be read in conjunction with the forms, plans and other supporting documents which together make up this planning application.

Application Site and Surrounding Area

Bold Hall, is a detached 2 storey house within its own spacious grounds, is an unlisted building built to replace a previous hall on the site. It was built in the mid - 20th Century, first appearing on the 1947 Ordnance Survey map.

The site is formerly part of a wider estate which of agricultural holdings and the current house sits upon the moated site, which is subject to scheduling, the previous hall being demolished in the early part of the 20th Century.

The south easter section of the moat has been filled in, as is identified in the heritage report, whilst the remaining sections of the moat have been drained and have been subject to natural revegetation.

The site is flanked to the southeast by a large collection of residential dwellings and farm buildings

Application Proposal

The proposal is to demolish the existing stables and replace with a true bungalow.

Planning Policy

The development plan in St Helens comprises the Saved Policies of the Unitary Development Plan, the Core Strategy Local Plan and the Joint Waste Local Plan. The following policies are relevant to the determination of this application.

CP 1 - Ensuring Quality Development in St. Helens

CP 2 -Creating an Accessible St. Helens

CQL 3 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

GB 1 - General Criteria for Development Control in the Green Belt

GB 8 - Change of Use of Existing Buildings into Dwellings

NPPF

80. Planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:

- a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside.
- b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets.
- c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting.
- d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or
- e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:
 - is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and
 - would significantly enhance its immediate setting and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

149. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry.
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments if the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
- c) the extension or alteration of a building if it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.
- e) limited infilling in villages.
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (Including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or

– not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

150. Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:

a) mineral extraction.

b) engineering operations.

c) local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location.

d) the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction.

e) material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and

f) development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.

Assessment

The pre-app response in November 2020 suggests that a justification for the removal of the stables be included in any submission. There is no policy or legal requirement for such a statement. The removal of a domestic stable is a 'lifestyle choice' based on the requirements of the applicant who wishes to create a small dwelling for their retirement as they have now reached that age.

Openness

The assessment of openness has both a spatial and visual context to it. In Spatial terms the following figures are applicable:

Area:

Proposed floor area 108m²

Existing floor area 117m²

Difference -7.7%

Volume:

Proposed floor area 402m³

Existing floor area 370m³

Difference 8.6%

Visually the site is as existing, the location of the stable block in the corner of a field used in connection with the hall. The proposed new bungalow would effectively be on the same footprint as the existing footprint, albeit in a slightly different shape.

The existing site is well screened by a multitude of buildings associated with the adjoining farm and associated outbuildings. As such it would be well screened from public viewing points and as such, visually would not have a greater impact on the openness of the green belt than the existing development.

Access

In the pre application response the idea was to take access directly down the side of the field from the Hall to the new dwelling. Notwithstanding a recent appeal decision in West Lancashire district APP/P2365/W/22/3300135 where a similar proposal was considered by the Inspector and found to be acceptable as follows:

“The proposal would also involve the creation of a new, fairly long, driveway and area of hardstanding for parking. These elements would increase the visual impact of the scheme, but the effect would be limited to the immediate garden setting. As they would not contribute to the built development on site, the effect of these flat features on the openness of the Green Belt would be negligible.”

However, notwithstanding the above the applicant has chosen to take the access via an existing field access between existing farm buildings of the neighbouring property to further minimise the effect on the green belt.

Ecology

The stables have been assessed and there are no ecological features of any significance which would preclude their demolition and the redevelopment going ahead.

Heritage

The proposed development site at Old Bold Hall, St. Helens, is adjacent to a moated Scheduled Ancient Monument and a Grade II Listed Bridge and Gate Piers.

A full heritage assessment is attached which concludes that there is no harm to either the Scheduled ancient monument or the listed bridge and Gate Piers

Contaminated Land

A full phase 1 assessment has been undertaken and is attached for submission.

Isolation

The site is not isolated having regard to the definition of isolations defined in case law following Braintree V Sec of State. The site is located immediately adjacent to a cluster of residential and farm buildings close to Warrington Road.

Trees

Notwithstanding the pre-application response which requested a full tree survey, the location is such that there are no trees within 30metres of the application site and non are affected.

Conclusions

The proposed development represents the redevelopment of previously developed land in the green belt in accordance with paragraph 149 (g) of the NPPF. As such it is by definition appropriate development in the green belt and thus represents sustainable development. There are no other material planning considerations which would preclude its approval.



RTPI

Chartered Town Planner